DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 553 32 CS 002 857

AUTHOR Turner, W. E.; Bare, Janet
TITLE A Report of the Corrective Reading Program, 1971-72.
INSTITUTION Wichita Public Schools, Kans.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Junior High Schools; Primary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Improvement; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading Programs; Staff Utilization; Word Recognition
IDENTIFIERS *Corrective Reading Program; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Kansas

ABSTRACT

The Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I program described in this paper served 1550 educationally deprived pupils in 82 Kansas elementary and junior high schools during the 1971-1972 academic year. The primary goals of the reading program were to improve and upgrade word recognition and reading skills and to improve pupils' attitudes. The remedial systems utilized were eclectic: individual teachers developed techniques which were most successful in their specific situations. Although participants ranged in level from grades one to nine, a special effort was made to provide instruction in the primary grades. Discussions of the educational context in which remediation occurred, of personnel utilization, of diagnostic techniques, and of evaluation of program success are included in the program description. Assessment of data revealed that from 54% to 73% of the students achieved at least one month's gain for each month of instruction, according to three evaluation measures. Recommendations urged that the corrective reading program be continued. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127553

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

02.00

WICHITA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Unified School District 259
Dr. Alvin E. Morris, Superintendent

A REPORT OF THE

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

1971-72

Funded by ESEA PL 89-10
Title I
Project 72062

Prepared by
W. E. Turner, Research Specialist
Janet Bare, Evaluation Assistant

Research and Evaluation Services Division
Dr. Ralph E. Walker, Director

August, 1972

CS 002 857

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM, 1971-72

SUMMARY

The Title I Corrective Reading program served 1550 educationally deprived pupils in 82 elementary and junior high schools during the 1971-72 academic year. Funds allocated for this program represented approximately 40 percent of Wichita's Title I allocation. The basic program format has been maintained since its beginning in the spring of 1966, although some revisions have been necessary. The remedial systems are eclectic; individual teachers develop techniques which they prefer and which are most successful in their particular situation.

The grade levels of the participants ranged from one to nine; there was a particular effort made to provide instruction in the primary grades. A total of 38.5 teaching positions were funded. Most of the positions were split-funded, with one teacher serving both Title I and non-Title I pupils. Many of the teachers had "floating" assignments, so that they met pupils in several different schools.

Measures of mean gains in months for each month of Corrective Reading were determined by teacher evaluation and pre and posttesting on two subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. The proportion of pupils who achieved at least month per month gains, as specified in program objectives, ranged from 54 to 73 percent across the three evaluation measures. It is recommended that the Corrective Reading program be continued.

ACTIVITY CONTEXT

Corrective reading has been a major component of the Wichita Title I project since its inception in 1966. Approximately 40 percent of the Title I funds received locally have been applied directly to reading programs. The Corrective Reading program furnishes special reading instruction in the elementary and junior high school grades (one through nine). Current trends in reading emphasize prevention rather than remediation, so that there is a particular concentration of effort directed toward the primary grade levels; there is also a strong emphasis on corrective reading at the seventh grade level. Integration efforts have necessitated the relocation of many target area pupils into schools dispersed throughout the city. In order to continue to meet the needs of these Title I-eligible students, the Corrective Reading program utilized "floating" teachers. Each teacher met pupils in as many as five of the schools receiving target area residents. Eligible students in such schools receive Title I extended services from staff who may serve portions of the populations of several qualifying schools. Along with the tendency over the last few years to concentrate corrective reading instruction at the lower grade levels, there has been an effort to further concentrate Title I services, including reading, in fewer Title I eligible schools.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Scope

A total of 1550 pupils participated in the 1971-72 Corrective Reading program. Of this number, approximately 95 percent were enrolled in public schools; the remaining five percent were parochial school students. The Corrective Reading program served pupils in 13 Title I elementary schools, 49 elementary and 16 junior high schools designated for Title I extended service, and four parochial schools. Pupils' grade levels ranged from first to ninth, although 52 percent of the children served were enrolled in the first three grades. Table 02.1 summarizes the participation records by sex, race, and grade levels. The primary goals of the reading program were to improve and upgrade word recognition and reading skills and to improve pupils' attitudes.

Personnel

Staff for the Title I reading program included 27.5 elementary and 11 junior high teaching positions, and 15 instructional aides. The Director of Reading for the Wichita Public Schools coordinated the Corrective Reading program, and two reading specialists served as consultants. Additional instructional assistance was provided by 12 parent volunteers, one retired teacher volunteer, and several sixth grade and junior high school pupils.

Director of Reading

"The Director of Reading is responsible to the Assistant Superintendent in charge of curriculum for leadership in reading education. He is also responsible for development and improvement of that part of the language arts program concerned with the mastery of fundamental reading skills by preschool, elementary, secondary, and post-high school pupils. More specific responsibilities are to:

1. Coordinate the developmental and corrective reading program in the school system.
2. Keep the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum informed on the development and progress of programs and activities concerned with the teaching of reading.
3. Work in a supporting role with the Director of Elementary Education and Director of Secondary Education on pertinent matters involving improvement of reading instruction.
4. Assume responsibility for developing inservice programs to improve the instruction in reading.
5. Assist in the selection of textbooks, materials, supplies, and equipment to be used in the reading program.
6. Expand curricular services to pupils by assisting in developing appropriate reading programs for summer school.
7. Keep informed and evaluate new instructional materials and methods for the improvement of reading instruction.
8. Assist the building administrator in solving problems which arise in his building pertinent to reading education.

9. Assist in the preparation of the Materials Catalog by assuming responsibility for revising and up-dating the listing of materials and equipment in reading accounts.
10. Direct the writing of manuals, guides and bulletins for teachers which outline the content, goals, materials, and methodology used in the teaching of reading.
11. Work cooperatively with colleges to encourage and stimulate the improvement of teacher training in reading.
12. Attend and participate in professional meetings at the local, state, and national level that are involved in up-grading and improving the teaching of reading."

Reading Specialists

Two corrective reading teachers served as reading specialists for the program. One is a specialist at the elementary level and the other is a secondary reading specialist; both are based at the Community Education Center. Their specific responsibilities are outlined as follows:

"1. To conduct and/or guide reading diagnostic services to pupils referred to the Center. Interpreting test results and planning the instructional phase will be an integral part of diagnosis.
2. To be available on call for limited diagnostic services to pupils at the building level where conditions make it impossible for them to come to the Reading Services Center.
3. To provide leadership in reading improvement through demonstrations, individual conferences and staff meetings.
4. To work cooperatively with Wichita State University in planning and conducting inservice experiences for teachers in reading.
5. To serve as a resource person for Title I and BOE special reading to develop greater continuity and more uniformity within all phases of the program.
6. To become more knowledgeable of reading improvement materials and equipment and to provide information to special reading teachers and to buildings of those proving most successful.
7. To provide supervision and guidance to volunteer and paraprofessional aides who work with pupils in Reading Services Center.
8. To provide leadership in promoting services available through the Center."

Special Reading Teachers

Approximately 44 staff members filled 27.5 elementary teaching positions, and 20 teachers filled 11 positions at the secondary level. This was due to the fact that nearly 75 percent of the personnel involved held assignments which were split-funded; that is, Title I paid the portion of their salaries which approximated time spent with target area pupils, and the balance was paid with regular funds.

Corrective reading teachers must hold a state reading certificate which requires a minimum of 12 semester hours in graduate reading courses. Most of the teachers are experienced with two or more years in the Corrective Reading Program.

The role of the special or corrective reading teacher is multi-faceted. The following is quoted from the Handbook for Corrective Reading (rev. 1969), Reading Department, USD 259, Wichita, Kansas:

"The special reading teacher has an important role in teaching pupils who are not making adequate progress in learning to read. The fulfillment of this role requires a sympathetic teacher who accepts the pupil as an individual, respects his integrity, provides reading materials with which he can be successful, and gives appropriate recognition to success in learning.

"The purpose of the special reading teacher is twofold: (1) To find out why a child is not profiting from the usual classroom instruction and (2) to remedy, if possible, the causes. In order to accomplish this, problems must be dealt with on an individual basis with relaxed instruction geared to the interest of the pupil. A reading teacher who is an enthusiastic reader herself will convey this enthusiasm to her students.

"In addition to helping individual pupils who are having reading difficulties, the effectiveness of reading instruction in the regular classroom can be elevated by consultation between the special reading teacher and the classroom teacher.

"A special reading teacher has a real opportunity to inform school patrons and the community at large of the need for improved reading instruction at all levels. This is essential if we are to achieve an improvement in the level of reading of the general public.

"As will be seen, numerous tests and records are employed in the special reading program, all of which should be used in assessing the individual's interests and abilities. The instructor is cautioned against using these devices as ends in themselves. Individual records would feasibly include test scores obtained from the Pupil Personnel Record. Additional diagnostic instruments are necessary for pupil placement. This data can then be utilized for grouping pupils according to reading needs for personalized instruction.

"Lesson planning is of necessity flexible, with pupil involvement an ideal. It should be noted that individuals respond best when a variety of methods and materials are provided. Since the listening and interest levels of disabled readers are usually significantly higher than their reading levels, occasionally more difficult materials may be read aloud by the teacher for added interest.

"It is important to nurture the confidence of parents of disabled readers in their offspring. These pupils need the assurance of parent-teacher cooperation and acceptance. This can be accomplished through school conferences and home visitation, scheduled during the suggested six hours per week recommended for planning, visitation, and conference."

Instructional Aides

The 15 aides, initiated with a five-day preservice training program, were employed 35 hours per week throughout the school year. Duties of the aides and volunteers were both clerical and instructional in nature. Instructional aides assisted by keeping classroom records, duplicating and assembling teaching materials, taking over the class while the teacher worked with an individual pupil, and meeting with children individually or in small groups to read to them or listen to them read.

Procedures

This report is an evaluation of the Corrective Reading program for the entire academic year, dating from August 26, 1971 to May 26, 1972. Late August and early September were spent identifying pupils in need of corrective reading instruction and organizing classes. An overview of the 1971-72 Corrective Reading program is provided by the following portions of a memo from the Director of Reading to All Principals and Special Reading Teachers (August 23, 1971):

"There are six phases in the corrective reading program: identification, screening, diagnosis, scheduling, instruction, and evaluation. It is recommended that a 'team' approach be used to identify pupils for possible placement in the special reading program. The 'team' approach will enable the administrators, classroom teachers and special reading teachers to cooperate in a successful endeavor to correct reading disabilities. The 'team' concept will enable the special reading teacher (SRT) to function more effectively, both in working with pupils and as a resource person for reading improvement at the building level.

"Identification

Identification procedures begin with the classroom teacher who makes referrals to the special reading program. Pupils are identified through the use of pupil's personnel record, observations, tests, reading record folder, and scattergrams. Revised Group Analysis Charts for each grade level have been prepared for use during the 1971-72 school year. Two basic considerations are significant:

1. "Standardized reading achievement tests and group intelligence tests are to be used within each school. Individual grade-level reading scores from these tests can be used in making a scattergram for each grade. Specific directions for completing this phase of the special reading program are available in a revised Reading Services bulletin."

   "Some buildings are using the Reading Study Achievement Tests. These tests can also be used in the identification phase. The profile sheet will identify pupils who score below 75 percent (frustration level) in specific reading skills taught in each book. These pupils should receive additional instruction in those skills before going into the next book.

2. "Classroom teachers should be encouraged to prepare referral forms for pupils being recommended for special reading instruction."

"Screening

Screening procedures in grades one to six are the responsibility of the special reading teacher, who, with the principal, decides which students from those previously identified will be scheduled for corrective reading classes. Factors considered will include the number of pupils needing help, case load, deficiencies in basic reading skills, and 'preventive' short-term instruction.

"Screening for junior high school special reading should precede scheduling. For this reason, the identification phase mentioned above is important. Guidance personnel are important members of the 'team' approach at the junior high school level. Factors considered by the SRT in screening students include the number recommended, the case load, student's success potential, attendance record and attitude.

"Diagnosis
Following completion of screening procedures, pupils are selected for placement in the corrective reading program. Diagnostic procedures for grades 1-9 must be initiated by the SRT before correction can begin. Since reading difficulties are related to a variety of problems, a knowledge of the whole child and his needs is essential to his reading improvement. The SRT will give each pupil several individual tests (formal and informal) for diagnostic purposes. Cumulative information from these tests, which includes results of an informal reading inventory, will be used to estimate:

1. Pupil's ability to profit from corrective reading instruction. A low score on a group IQ test should not automatically eliminate a pupil for possible placement in the program. Decisions to schedule pupils are made on an individual basis with the question, 'Can this pupil benefit from special reading instruction?' used as a guide.

2. The extent of his reading disability.

"Scheduling
The inter-discipline 'team' approach should be used whenever feasible to schedule pupils in special reading classes. The SRT, administrator, nurse, and school counselor plan supporting roles. The following guide-lines should be considered for scheduling purposes:

1. In certain situations, first grade pupils can be given priority for placement in special reading. Experience has shown that in these situations it is better for the SRT to work cooperatively with the first grade teacher within the regular classroom rather than take the pupil out for special instruction. This type of program places emphasis on prevention of reading problems and at this level is not classified as corrective reading instruction."

2. Following the consideration listed above, second graders should receive next priority, then work up through the grades.

3. Beginning with second grade, pupils with greater capacities for learning should receive first consideration.

4. If possible, pupils with corresponding reading problems should be scheduled together.

5. The 'mild corrective' and 'corrective' students will be selected prior to other type of reading disabilities.

6. Experiences in organizing classes for special reading show that we can cross grade levels when scheduling for instruction. There is some evidence to justify the organization of classes so that boys and girls are instructed separately in grades 7-9. However this is a matter of choice and has not been a problem.

   At the secondary level use discretion as to past attendance records in determining whether a student will attend frequently enough to profit from reading instruction.

7. It is suggested that 'mild corrective' and corrective readers be given preference over 'severe correctives' and/or 'remedial' cases. However, there may be cases when the SRT will find it feasiblt to schedule one group of 'severe correctives.' This decision should be only if the SRT has the time and competency for helping these pupils. The SRT should be aware of her role on a building staff and be willing to assume some responsibility for helping to promote acceptance of the program by pupils, fellow-teachers, and community.

8. 'Severe Correctives' should be referred to the Reading Services Center for a more comprehensive diagnostic testing and for possible placement in a program of instruction at the C.E.C.

9. Special reading teachers are guided by the following criteria when attempting to estimate the extent to which a child is disabled in reading:

   A. MILD CORRECTIVE

      a. Normal IQ - has ability to profit from short term corrective program
      b. One or two years behind grade level in reading
      c. Has some reading skills, weak in either word recognition and/or comprehension
      d. Is able to do some reading, but dislikes reading
      e. Embarrassed over poor reading achievement
      f. In most cases his problem is one of attitude. He can be helped through a close relationship with a teacher and through 'success steps' in reading
      g. Does not have a known psychological or neurological problem

   B. CORRECTIVE

      a. Normal IQ
      b. Is two or more years behind grade level in reading
      c. Has been unable to develop reading skills and needs help in this area
      d. The pupil knows he is a failure and has developed a poor attitude and a negative self-concept
      e. Does not have a known psychological or neurological problem

C. SEVERE CORRECTIVE AND/OR REMEDIAL

a. Normal IQ
b. Non-reader - needs extended help in reading and personality
c. Has known psychological and/or neurological handicaps
d. Needs a specialized program (the usual visual-auditory methods are not sufficient to overcome reading problem)
e. The inter-discipline 'team' approach to instruction must be used

10. The principal, classroom teacher, and SRT will draw up the schedule for corrective reading groups.

11. Some pupils may be in the program for approximately nine weeks, others eighteen weeks, still others may be in the program the entire year.

12. Recommendations for phasing a pupil out of the program is the responsibility of the SRT in cooperation with the building administrator and classroom teacher.

"Instruction
Size of group for instruction: (Maximum sizes are listed below)

Type	Lesson	Sessions Per Week	Group Size
Mild Corrective	30-40 minutes	2-3	5 to 8 children
Corrective	30-40 minutes	3-4	3 to 5 children
Severe Corrective and/or Remedial	30 minutes or less	4-5	2 to 3 children
Reading Improvement	1 hour	5	15 children

"The measure of success in reading improvement is largely determined by what takes place during the instructional phase of the corrective reading program. The SRT has at least two opportunities for effecting reading improvement. First, is the direct effect by working with individual pupils in special reading. Second, and more indirect, but nevertheless effective, is through serving as a catalyst for improving reading instruction at the building level.

"The special reading teacher with the assistance of the principal, should schedule one-fifth of her week to planning, visitation, and conference. Included in this block of time are:

meeting with parents of disabled readers

serving as a building consultant to classroom teachers

maintaining individual records of students admitted to the corrective reading program.

"Some deviations from the regular Corrective Reading program are planned for the FY 1972. A primary reading program with emphasis on prevention of reading problems and changes in instructional procedures in junior high school special reading are planned for selected school attendance centers. A brief description of each program follows:

"Children with potential reading disabilities can be identified at an early school age. Deficiencies in readiness noted in kindergarten will be the determining factors in the selection of children to receive special reading instruction at the first grade level. Priority will be placed with first grade, then moved upward through second and third grades. A Special Reading Teacher will work with not more than five classrooms in a building with a paraprofessional assigned as a member of the "reading team." Instruction will be given in regular classrooms. The case load for special reading will be the number identified as potential reading problems within each classroom.

"The Reading Center concept will be the focus for reading instruction at Brooks, Roosevelt, Truesdell, and Wilbur junior high schools. Seventh grade English classes will be scheduled in the Reading Center for a 6-9 weeks reading unit with their regular English teacher. Screening and scheduling for Corrective Reading will be scheduled in the Reading Center during the second, third, and fourth quarter. The case load equivalent for Corrective Reading will be the same as specified for the regular program.

"The SRT will do well to consider the four R's of helping children with reading difficulties:

1. Re-orient attitudes--negative attitudes have prevailed and the SRT should strive to promote the positive aspect of learning to read.

2. Review and reteach reading skills--cracking the printed code and reading comprehension skills will receive major emphasis in the special reading program.

3. Re-educate and correct confusion--as an SRT, expertise has been developed in diagnosis of reading problems. The prognosis will re-cycle the pupil in basic skills development.

4. Reinforce learning--when planning activities for pupils with reading problems, repetition will tend to reinforce skills. Methods should vary and include auditory, visual, and kinesthetic approaches to word recognition. When a strength modality is known, this approach should receive major emphasis."

Pre and posttesting of all Corrective Reading pupils was done using the various forms of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. Pretests were administered during the first three weeks of school; posttesting was to be completed no later than May 12, 1972. Pupils who were phased out of the reading program during the year were posttested at the time of their withdrawal. These test scores, along with other relevant data, were reported for purposes of evaluation.

A variety of equipment was used to implement the Corrective Reading program, including controlled readers, filmstrip projectors, record players, cassette and reel recorders, and overhead projectors.

Four inservice meetings were planned during the school year for teachers. Additional opportunities for training are available annually in the form of summer reading workshops, most of which can be taken for graduate credit. Instructional aides were given a week of preservice orientation and training.

Teachers were urged to foster parental interest and involvement in the program. Provisions were made so that a fifth of the teacher's weekly schedule was reserved for planning, visitation, and consultation.

A report of Wichita's Corrective Reading program was published by HEW as one of 34 promising programs in childhood education. Copies of this booklet may be obtained from the U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402, for 20 cents each (refer to catalog number HE 5.220:20158).

Budget

Funds for the Corrective Reading program were provided by ESEA, Title I. A total of $491,344 was expended for the 1971-72 program. This amount included $441,108 for salaries, $21,016 for O.A.S.I., $17,700 for equipment and supplies, $9,900 for training stipends and workshops, and $1,620 for mileage of "floating" teachers. Expenses not represented in the above figure include the salary of the Director of Reading and costs of building and maintenance, all of which are provided by the local education agency. Purchase of major items of equipment was completed in previous years and thus is not a part of the 1971-72 budget. Based on a total of 1550 participants, the per pupil cost of the Corrective Reading program was $317.00.

EVALUATION

The Title I Corrective Reading program in USD 259 for the academic year of 1971-72 had as its main goals the improving and upgrading of word recognition and reading comprehension skills.

Based on the above stated goals, the following objectives were selected for evaluation:

1) A Corrective Reading program for educationally deprived children will be provided as shown by the designation of financial resources for the program and by the assignment of staff to implement the program.

2) Corrective Reading teachers will identify those pupils in the target schools, grades 1 through 9, who are eligible for placement in Corrective Reading classes as shown by a list of eligible pupils maintained by each school. Criteria for eligibility will be based on observations of the classroom teacher, on the pupil's ability to profit from Corrective Reading instruction, and on the pupils reading retardation as shown by standardized tests.

3) Pupils enrolled in Title I Corrective Reading will show improvements in:

   a. the reading instructional grade level of at least month per month gains* as shown by teacher evaluation of the pupil's performance on graded text, word lists, or other measure;

b. the reading vocabulary of at least month per month gains* as shown by comparisons of pretest and posttest results on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Vocabulary Tests;

c. the reading comprehension of at least month per month gains* as shown by comparisons of pretest and posttest results on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension Tests.

Table 02.1 summarizes the Corrective Reading participation statistics by sex, race, and grade level. As the Table indicates, over 56 percent of the pupils were boys. Distribution by race of the 1550 participants was 70 percent Negro, 24 percent Caucasian and slightly less than six percent representing the remaining categories of Mexican American, American Indian, Oriental, and other or undetermined. Nearly 52 percent of the pupils were in the first, second, or third grades; only 31 percent were of junior high school age. Table 02.2 gives the same information for non-public school participants, who represent about five percent of the total population served. Within this smaller group, the tendency for there to be more boys than girls in Corrective Reading is accentuated. The racial breakdown of the non-public group does not reflect that of the larger population; in the non-public group, the percentages of Caucasian and Mexican American pupils are larger, and the proportion of the group which is Negro is much smaller.

Achievement of the first objective, that a Corrective Reading program would be provided for educationally deprived children, was to be determined on the basis of monies and staff used to implement the project. Based on the reported budget of $491,344 and a staff of 38.5 teaching positions and 15 instructional aides, it may be concluded that this objective was met.

The second objective stated that Corrective Reading teachers would identify those pupils eligible for placement in the Corrective Reading program. Because the Corrective Reading teachers, in collaboration with other school personnel, tested and screened potential participants in the process of enrolling 1550 pupils in their program, it seems clear that this objective was also met.

The last objective specified at least month per month gains in pupils'

a) reading instructional grade level, as shown by teacher evaluation;

b) reading vocabulary, as shown by comparisons of pre and posttest results on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Vocabulary Tests; and

c) reading comprehension, as measured by pre and post scores on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension Test.

Tables 02.3, 02.4, and 02.5 summarize the information relevant to parts a, b, and c, respectively, of this objective.

According to Table 02.3, teachers reported month per month, or better, mean gains for more than half of their pupils in grades 2 through 9. Least improvement was shown by the first grade group; less than 33 percent of the pupils evaluated showed a minimum of one month gain for every month they had been in Corrective Reading. The fourth grade pupils showed the greatest gains. Teachers reported that 86 percent of this group made the necessary improvement.

* Month per month gains is defined as one month gain for one month of instruction

TABLE 02.1

TOTAL PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN CORRECTIVE READING BY GRADE LEVEL, SEX, AND RACE

Grade	Number	Sex		Race					
		Male	Female	Caucasian	Oriental	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Other
1	188	107	81	34	1	147	4	1	1
2	376	202	174	136	0	215	14	7	4
3	241	137	104	78	0	157	2	2	2
4	157	94	63	38	0	111	8	0	0
5	66	39	27	15	0	46	3	1	1
6	45	27	18	9	0	35	0	1	0
7	264	144	120	23	0	718	3	5	15
8	128	70	58	26	0	89	2	3	8
9	85	53	32	18	0	67	0	0	0
Totals	1550	873	677	377	1	1085	36	20	31
Percents	100.0	56.3	43.7	24.3	0.1	70.0	2.3	1.3	2.0

TABLE 02.2

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN CORRECTIVE READING
BY GRADE LEVEL, SEX, AND RACE

Grade	Number	Sex		Race					
		Male	Female	Caucasian	Oriental	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Other
2	19	11	8	6	0	8	5	0	0
3	12	9	3	8	0	3	0	0	1
4	21	13	8	11	0	7	3	0	0
5	11	4	7	5	0	5	1	0	0
6	7	6	1	4	0	3	0	0	0
7	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Totals	72	45	27	34	0	28	9	0	1
Percents	100.0	62.5	37.5	47.2	0	38.9	12.5	0	1.4

TABLE 02.3

MONTHLY GAINS SCORED BY CORRECTIVE READING PUPILS
ON INSTRUCTIONAL READING GRADE LEVEL (TEACHER EVALUATION)

N=1100

Grade	Number Pupils	Mean Gains per Month of Corrective Reading Instruction							
		1.5 or more		1.0 to 1.4		.7 to .9		.6 or less	
		No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*
1	61	10	16.4	10	16.4	3	4.9	38	62.3
2	278	161	57.9	31	11.2	17	6.1	69	24.8
3	177	102	57.6	36	20.3	7	4.0	32	18.1
4	133	87	65.4	28	21.0	1	.7	17	12.8
5	55	31	56.4	19	34.5			5	9.1
6	44	30	68.2	6	13.6	3	6.8	5	11.4
7	205	127	62.0	28	13.7	8	3.9	42	20.5
8	83	37	44.6	15	18.1	4	4.8	27	32.5
9	64	34	53.1	6	9.4	7	10.9	17	26.6

* Percents are rounded

TABLE 02.4

MONTHLY GAINS SCORED BY CORRECTIVE READING PUPILS
ON GATES-MACGINITIE (VOCABULARY SUBTEST)

N=888

Grade	Number Pupils	Mean Gains per Month of Corrective Reading Instruction							
		1.5 or more		1.0 to 1.4		.7 to .9		.6 or less	
		No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*
2	187	71	38.0	42	22.5	15	8.0	59	31.6
3	120	41	34.1	27	22.5	11	9.1	41	34.1
4	101	31	30.7	22	21.8	12	11.9	36	35.6
5	51	22	43.1	10	19.6	8	15.7	11	21.6
6	37	16	43.2	6	16.2	6	16.2	9	24.3
7	229	124	54.1	12	5.2	6	2.6	87	38.0
8	100	46	46.0	7	7.0	4	4.0	43	43.0
9	63	32	50.8	9	14.3			22	34.9

* Percents are rounded

TABLE 02.5

MONTHLY GAINS SCORED BY CORRECTIVE READING PUPILS
ON GATES-MACGINITIE (COMPREHENSION SUBTEST)

N=876

Grade	Number Pupils	Mean Gains per Month of Corrective Reading Instruction							
		1.5 or more		1.0 to 1.4		.7 to .9		.6 or less	
		No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*	No.	Percent*
2	184	55	29.9	38	20.7	23	12.5	68	37.0
3	120	34	28.3	27	22.5	10	8.3	49	41.0
4	101	31	30.7	19	18.8	10	9.9	41	40.6
5	50	17	34.0	8	16.0	4	8.0	21	42.0
6	37	18	48.6	5	13.5	4	10.8	10	27.0
7	228	115	50.4	22	9.6	14	6.1	77	33.8
8	96	44	45.8	8	8.3	4	4.2	40	41.7
9	60	26	43.3	6	10.0	3	5.0	25	41.7

* Percents are rounded

Overall, 73 percent of the pupils for whom data were available showed instructional reading grade level gains of one or more months for each month in Corrective Reading. It is interesting to note that 56 percent of the population showed mean gains of at least 1.5 months and 23 percent showed gains of .6 month or less per month in the program; 21 percent of the pupils evaluated made monthly gains in the .7 to 1.4 months range.

Improvement in reading vocabulary was also reported in month per month gains, as measured on the Vocabulary subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie. The criterion of month per month mean gain was reached or surpassed by 58 percent of the 888 pupils tested. More than 60 percent of the second, fifth, and ninth grade pupils tested, showed month per month vocabulary improvement, while over 57 percent of the third, sixth and seventh grade children did so. Among the group as a whole, 43 percent made gains of at least 1.5 months, 35 percent gained no more than .6 months per month, and 22 percent gained from .7 to 1.4 months for every month spent in the program.

Some 54 percent of the pupils tested showed the specified monthly gains on the Comprehension subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie. Fifty percent or more of pupils of all grades except the fourth grade made at least month per month gains. Results for the entire group indicate that 39 percent of the pupils made mean gains of at least 1.5 month per month on the Comprehension subtest, while 38 percent gained no more than .6 months for each month enrolled in Corrective Reading. The remaining 23 percent made gains between .7 and 1.4 months for each month in corrective reading.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been determined that the proportion of pupils who performed at or above the month per month gain standard, specified in the program objectives, ranged from 54 to 73 percent of the group tested. In view of the continued emphasis on communications and the need to upgrade the achievement level of educationally deprived pupils, it is recommended that the program be continued as one of the major components of Wichita's Title I project.

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - 1974-75

Wichita's program for compensatory education began in the spring of 1966 as a Title I project with Corrective Reading as its focus. The long range goal is for Title I eligible students to improve the basic reading skills of vocabulary and comprehension.

The instructional objectives are that, given corrective reading instruction, the students will

A. make a mean gain of 0.8 in grade equivalent per year of instruction as measured by vocabulary, comprehension or composite reading score on a standardized test (1)

B. raise their reading instructional grade level as measured by an informal reading inventory and/or teacher judgment

C. demonstrate an observable improved attitude toward reading as measured by an attitude scale

D. exhibit improved language arts and communication skills as measured by teacher judgment

The program focuses on special reading instruction with primary thrust on a preventive approach - beginning with Grade 2 and progressing upward. ESEA-Title I program for FY-75 will provide compensatory education for grades (2-6). A severe corrective program is available on a referral basis for eligible Title I students (grades 4-6 and grades 7-9).

Second-semester first-grade pupils may be referred for special reading instruction based on the needs assessment and accepted on a space-available basis.

In May, 1971, the Board of Education adopted a plan for integration which required busing of Title I eligible pupils to all attendance centers which do not have an acceptable proportion of black students. The 1971-72 project proposal was changed to provide extended reading services to Title I eligible students who are bused to attendance centers outside the assigned attendance area, as well as to three Title I residence schools within the AAA district (Mueller, Ingalls and L'Ouverture).

The 1974-75 program design has been modified to provide a Systems Instructional Approach in all Title I Attendance Centers. (Alcott, Franklin and Linwood are not included since they were added to the list of Title I Attendance Centers late in FY-74.)

(1) Recent study published by USOE entitled: The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education, Summary and Review of the Evidence, states that "A 0.7 gain in grade equivalent per year is usually the most which disadvantaged children gain in one year of school. (approximately 0.8 gain in grade equivalent per year on large city norms)."

Split Funding -

A plan of split funding between Title I and BOE for special reading teacher positions will be continued to provide corrective reading services for Title I eligible pupils who are being bused to non Title I Attendance Centers. The formula for split funding is based on the number of eligible Title I pupils to comply with the comparability factor in Title I. Split funding obviates against any tendency to segregate for instructional purposes and provides the opportunity to schedule non Title I eligible students on a space available basis. (A copy of proposed staffing and funding source is included in the appendix.)

Procedures -

There are six phases in the corrective reading program: identification, screening, diagnosis, scheduling, instruction and evaluation. Team Approach: Keys to Reading Success is the corrective reading guide. The guide was revised Summer, 1974, and is used by SRT in organizing corrective reading at the building level. Project Performance Objectives and Instructional Process Objectives are integral factors in implementing the program. These are revised each year - copies are attached to this bulletin.

Parent Involvement -

Parent involvement has been a "built-in" factor in the corrective reading program since its inception in 1966. Special reading teachers' time allocation requires 4/5 for pupil instruction and 1/5 for conferences (school and home), individual evaluations, and instructional planning. Procedures include involving the Title I Parent Council in the recruitment of additional paraprofessional aides. To insure direct communication between parents and reading staff, Special Reading Services will send a representative to Parent Council meetings.

Additional efforts to secure parent involvement will be made through tutoring programs. A Title I Parent Program has been funded for the 1974-75 school year. Parent aides will be employed to tutor students individually or in small groups according to need. Parent aides will also recruit classroom volunteers and work closely with the volunteer tutor program funded by ESAA.

Needs Assessment -

A needs assessment has been determined by the Division of Research and Evaluation of the number and percent of high and low achievers in reading based on the 1973-74 basic test program. Three tests were employed: Metropolitan Readiness Test in first grade, Metropolitan Achievement Test in second grade and Iowa Test of Basic Skills in the upper grades.

Needs Assessment - (Cont'd)

Individual children's educational deficiencies and instructional needs will be assessed by the evidence available from pupil personnel records, the results of educational tests in cumulative reading folders and specific skill deficiencies revealed by criterion referenced tests and/or Basal Mastery Tests. With this evidence, teachers and administrators can develop a documented list of needs in order of priority.

Program Design -

A. More concentrated services
   a. 33 SRTs are assigned to 1 building
      16 SRTs are assigned to 2 buildings
      7 SRTs are assigned to 3 buildings
      1 SRT is assigned to 4 buildings
   b. 2 centers have 2 SRTs
      4 schools have 1 1/2 SRTs (including Reading Services Center)
   c. 24.5 reading aides are employed with Title I funds

B. Competitive effectiveness of four "Systems" approaches to corrective reading instruction will begin in all Title I Attendance Centers (Alcott, Franklin and Linwood not included). A research design will be developed to measure reading achievement of the four Systems.

   1. The Hoffman program will be continued at Washington and Wells and initiated at Kellogg, MacArthur and Rogers.
   2. The Listen, Look and Learn Program will be continued at Irving, Payne, Harry Street and Funston.
   3. Psychotechnics Reading Skills Development Laboratory Systems will be used at Dodge, Lincoln, and Bridgeport.
   4. Random-House High-Intensity Learning Systems will be used at Longfellow and Park.
   5. Distar Reading and Language Classes will be continued at Dodge, Longfellow and Washington.

C. The Special Reading Program for Severe Corrective grades 4-9 will be continued at the CEC building. Instruction will be provided for approximately 48 students each nine weeks. Transportation is provided for Title I eligible pupils.

Instructional Information SRT - Special Reading Teacher

Reading Activities

This section describes the specific reading instructional activities developed to meet the documented learner needs. This information should be included for each instructional activity.

Level(s) of instructional activity Grades 1-6 - Corrective Reading

1. What documented specific learner needs from Table 2 was this instructional activity designed to meet?
Table 2-A reports mean deviations on the ITBS Title I schools and non-Title I schools. The deviations clearly show documented need in both vocabulary and reading comprehension.

2. How was the instructional activity originated, developed, or adapted? Program originated as a Title I program in January 1966. The present program was developed as an outgrowth of Corrective Reading workshops in summer, 1966 and 1967. The program has been adapted and improved each year to meet changes in guidelines. Current program revised spring, 1974, using committee of special reading teachers.

3. What theories form the bases for the instructional activities (e.g., reinforcement, behavior modification, language experience, etc.)?
Reinforcement of basic reading skills with major emphasis on word recognition and reading comprehension. Wider recreational reading is stressed.

4. How are the learners organized for the instructional activities (e.g., self-contained, individualized, open classroom, open school, etc.)?
   1. Small group instruction based on individual needs.
   2. Team approach in regular classroom using SRT, classroom teacher and reading aide.

5. What teacher-student ratios will be maintained in the instructional activities?

1 - 8 per hour

6. What materials, special equipment, or facilities are utilized in the instructional activities (include formal titles and sources)? 1. Fountain Valley Teacher Support System - Dick Ziege, Inc.; 2. EDL Programs: Look, Listen and Learn; 3. Hoffman Educational Systems; 4. Psychotechnics Reading Development Laboratory Systems; 5. Random-House High Intensity Learning Systems; 6. Distar (SRA).

7. What are the major methods and techniques utilized in the instructional activities?
There are six phases: Identification, screening, diagnosis, scheduling, instruction, and evaluation. Emphasis is on a "Systems" approach to corrective reading.

Project Performance Objectives

Reading

Learner(s)	Skill or Concept	Level of Behavior	Measurement	Proficiency Level	Time
ESEA Title I Corrective Reading students grades 2-6	Vocabulary Comprehension	Knowledge Knowledge	California Achievement Test	0.8 mean gain in grade equivalent, pre to post test	Project Year
ESEA Title I Corrective Reading students grades 2-6	Instructional Level	Knowledge	Informal Reading Inventory and/or teacher judgment	Advance in reader level pre to post test	Project Year
ESEA Title I Corrective Reading students grades 2-6	Attitude toward reading	Affective	Locally Developed Attitude Scale	Improve pre to post test	Project Year
ESEA Title I Corrective Reading students grades 2-6	Communication skills - spoken and/or written	Affective	Teacher judgment and locally developed survey	Improvement noted	Project Year
Reading Students Grade 1	Reading Readiness	Knowledge	Mastery tests accompanying basal program and Skill Box Activities	Satisfactory progress during second semester of project year	Second Semester Project Year

Instructional Process Objectives

READING

Person(s) Responsible	Activity	Completion Date		Documentation
		Planned	Actual	
1. Team (Reading teacher, classroom teacher, administrator, counselor, nurse)	Identification of Title I eligible students by residence and educational needs	Sept. 15		Title I Student Data Sheet; address; April 1973 test data
2. Reading teacher	Screening of eligible students to establish priorities of needs	Sept. 15		San Diego Quick Assessment Silvaroli Classroom Inventory
3. Reading teacher	Administer Reading Attitude Scale	Sept. 15		Pretest - Attitude Scale
4. Team	Scheduling Corrective Reading classes	Sept. 15		Title I Student Data Sheet; approved class list
5. Team	Diagnosis of individual reading problems	Continuing		California Reading Test; Pretest and Appropriate Instruments
6. Reading teacher	Schedule 1/5 of time for conferences, individualized testing and instructional planning	Weekly		Lesson plan book
7. Reading teacher and aide	Small group prescriptive instruction in 30-60 minute sessions	3 to 5 times weekly		Lesson plan book
8. Reading teacher	Implement instruction using an eclectic or system approach, whichever has been approved	Weekly		Log of Materials Utilization
9. Reading teacher, classroom teacher	Evaluation, phasing out and scheduling in on space available basis	Continuing		Title I Student Data Sheet
10. Reading teacher, classroom teacher	Assessment of 1st grade achievement using teacher judgment, criterion referenced tests, basal tests	Jan. 21		Title I Student Data Sheet; address

Instructional Process Objectives

READING

	Person(s) Responsible	Activity	Completion Date		Documentation
			Planned	Actual	
11.	Reading teacher and/or aide	Evaluation of all corrective students using California Reading post test, Silvaroli and criterion referenced tests	End of Project Year		Year-End-Report Title I Student Data Sheet
12.	Reading teacher and/or aide	Evaluation of pupils attitude toward reading	End of Project Year		Post-test - Attitude Scale

Staffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

Schools	% Low Income By Resident 1973-74	Bused From AAA '73-74	Predicted Enrollment	Total number and % of pupils at 20% or below ITBS Gr. 3-6 10-72		Proposed Funding Source			
				number	%ile	Title I	BOE	ESAA	Para-professions
L'Ouverture	59.9	(0)		40	42%	.6	.4		1.0
Park	55.4	(7)	152	69	53%	.8	.2		.5
Ingalls	54.7	(0)		64	22%	.6	.4		1.0
Kellogg	52.2	(56)	186	25	21%	.8	.2		
Funston	51.4	(0)	356	37	19%	.8	.2		1.0
Washington	42.0	(19)	293	23	21%	.8	.2		
Rogers	40.0	(0)	355	38	26%	.8	.2		1.0
Payne	38.6	(90)	514	73	29%	1.2	.3		1.0
Sp. Assign CEC						.3	.2		1.0
Wells	37.3	(0)	276	42	25%	.8	.2		
MacArthur	36.3	(5)	328	39	32%	.8	.2		1.0
Irving	35.7	(13)	405	50	28%	1.1	.4		1.0
Dodge	35.6	(18)	443	51	23%	.8	.2		
Bridgeport	35.0	(0)	172	22	39%	.7	.3		1.0
Kistler	7.1	(12)	286	25	14%				
Earhart	5.4	(41)	171	10	18%				
Lincoln	32.5	(48)	294	39	33%	.8	.2		
Harry Street	32.2	(76)	357	51	29%	.8	.2		1.0
Longfellow	32.1	(42)	289	37	24%	.8	.2		.5

Staffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

Schools	% Low Income By Resident 1973-74	Bused From AAA '73-74	Predicted Enrollment	Total number and % of pupils at 20% or below ITBS Gr. 3-6 10-72		Proposed Funding Source			
				number	%ile	Title I	BOE	ESAA	Para-professional
Franklin	31.0	(54)	339	61	32%	1.3	.2		
Arkansas Avenue	30.5	(163)	466	66	23%	.6	.4		1.0
Cloud	27.7					1.4	.6		
Alcott	25.8	(15)	228	18	16%	1.4	.6		
Mueller	49.8	(0)		90	24%				
Linwood	25.3	(56)	251	41	30%	.8	.2		
Lawrence	24.0	(22)	280	42	35%	.8	.2		
Christ The King									
Stanley	21.7	(75)	412	56	24%	.7	.3		
Jefferson	21.1	(39)	323	21	22%	.6	.4		
Fabrique	2.9	(83)	246	25	18%				
Benton	20.0	(8)	437	39	16%	.7	.3		
Kensler	0.8	(136)	727	86	20%				
McCollom	0.4	(108)	621	68	18%	.6	.4		1.0
Peterson	0.2	(67)	458	24	10%				
McCormick	18.4	(32)	271	26	20%	.7	.3		
Meridian	15.8	(64)	292	22	22%				
White	16.2	(16)	269	27	18%	.6	.4		.5
Cessna	4.9	(62)	520	43	16%				
Carter	15.2	(15)	280	19	13%		.4	.6	

Staffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

Schools	% Low Income By Resident 1973-74	Bused From AAA '73-74	Predicted Enrollment	Total number and % of pupils at 20% or below ITBS Gr. 3-6 10-72		Proposed Funding Source			
				number	%ile	Title I	BOE	ESAA	Para-professional
Field	14.5	(33)	230	23	20%	.3	.2	.5	
Buckner	14.4	(49)	278	31	15%			1.0	
Woodman	11.2	(70)	879	74	14%	.6	.4		.5
Gardiner	11.1	(88)	333	59	30%	.7	.3		1.0
Chisholm	2.2	(149)	314	41	28%				
Martin	10.9	(39)	292	41	26%	.7	.3		
Cleaveland	6.7	(25)	331	38	20%				
Caldwell	10.7	(49)	317	36	23%	.6	.4		
College Hill	4.8	(71)	360	31	16%				
Enterprise	8.5	(46)	590	46	16%	.7	.3		.5
Sim	7.2	(45)	259	46	24%				
Greiffenstein	8.5	(42)	259	15	12%	.6	.4		1.0
Sowers	2.4	(35)	231	23	14%				
Wilson	4.2	(48)	228	30	26%				
Riverview	8.5	(50)	250	39	26%	.6	.4		
Sunnyside	7.5	(0)	303	58	23%		1.0		
Chisholm Trail	6.7	(82)	583	93	27%		1.0		
Bryant	6.6	(101)	518	93	29%	.7	.3		1.0
O K	0.4	(95)	487	35	12%	.6	.4		
Riverside	6.3	(46)	235	39	26%		.2	.8	

taffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

chools	% Low Income By Resident 1973-74	Bused From AAA '73-74	Predicted Enrollment	Total number and % of pupils at 20% or below ITBS Gr. 3-6 10-72		Proposed Funding Source			
				number	%ile	Title I	BOE	ESAA	Para-professiona
lack	5.6	(56)	458	44	16%	.6	.4		
Woodland	4.6	(45)	275	43	23%				
llen	4.3	(22)	315	24	15%	.7	.3		1.0
Booth	0.0	(22)	249	20	16%				
Griffith	0.9	(44)	250	20	18%				
inneha	4.3	(98)	631	62	18%	.4	.2	1.4	
leasant Valley	4.1	(41)	260	23	12%	.6	.4		1.0
Michener	0.0	(67)	204	26	22%				
McLean	0.0	(46)	300	10	5%				
outh Hillside	3.2	(30)	264	20	9%	.7	.3		
Harris	0.0	(55)	345	13	7%				
St. Margaret Mary									
elly	3.1	(104)	718	66	17%	.6	.4		.5
Knight	1.2	(22)	241	30	17%				
arrison	0.9	(40)	239	27	23%	.1	.1	.8	.5
tearman	0.5	(51)	465	34	14%	.6	.4		1.0
Seltzer	1.0	(21)	164	26	20%				
Clark	2.4	(38)	317	25	18%				
yde	0.0	(79)	352	27	12%	.6	.4		1.0
Price	0.0	(65)	282	8	4%				
Adams	4.0	(67)	310	24	18%				
evere orrective						.8	.2		1.0

Staffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

Schools	% Low Income By Resident 1973-74	Bused From AAA '73-74	Predicted Enrollment	Total number and % of pupils at 20% or below ITBS Gr. 3-6 10-72 number	%ile	Proposed Funding Source Title I	BOE	ESAA	Para-professional
Distar						1.0			
Reading Specialist CEC						.6	.4		
Parochial						1.0			1.0
CEC - Reading Specialist (Special Assignment)						.5			.5
						38.4	18.0	5.1	24.5

31

Staffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

Schools	Enrollment 1-18-74	Predicted Enrollment	Total number and % of pupils at 20% or below ITBS Gr. (7-9) 10-72 number	%ile	Grades 7	8	9	Proposed Funding Source ESAA	BOE	Aides
Allison	634	565	141	31	171	20		1.0		1.0
Brooks	824	817	140	25	315	60			1.0	
Coleman	926	900	81	14	280				1.0	
Curtis	1049	968	153	23	325	140			1.0	
Hadley	796	771	133	25	247	128			1.0	
Hamilton	660	663	137	34	230	82		2.0		1.0
Horace Mann	473	440	137	46	99	104	98	1.0		2.0
Jardine	743	737	163	36	225	36	2	2.0		1.0
Marshall	677	555	82	16	50	25			1.0	
Mayberry	650	625	142	34	204	45		1.0	1.0	1.0
Mead	725	732	97	19	214	35			1.0	
Pleasant Valley	937	953	151	27					1.0	
Robinson	673	659	48	10	197	35			1.0	
Roosevelt	535	532	90	27	156	175	70	1.0		1.0
Truesdell	1926	1935	282	24	620	138			2.0	
Wilbur	1105	1116	105	15	372	75			1.0	
Reading Specialist CEC							(Title I)	.5	.5	
Severe Corrective							(Title I)	.5	.5	

Staffing 1974-75 Special Reading

August 21, 1974

Schools	Enrollment 1-18-74	Predicted Enrollment	Number in Program	Grade Level			Proposed Funding Source		
							Title I	BOE	Aides
East	2130		568	10	11	12		2.0	
Heights	1447		360	10	11	12		1.0	
North	1922		604	10				1.0	
South	1873		743	10				1.0	
Southeast	2129		778	10				1.0	
West	2125		772	10				2.0	